LB
41
N48

SUPERINTENDENTS ANNUAL ADDRESS TO THE TEACHERS, MASTERS AND SUPERVISORS OF THE NEWTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

WHAT ARE YOU DOING?

WHY ARE YOU DOING IT?

WHY DO YOU DO IT LIKE THAT?

1837

THE

Superintendent's Annual Address

TO THE

Teachers, Masters and Supervisors

OF THE

Newton Public Schools

OCTOBER, 1907

Printed with Additions and Questions

OCT 1908

FANNING PRINTING CO.
NEWTON UPPER FALLS, MASS.
1907.

LB41
N48

FOREWORD.

To the Teachers, Masters, and Supervisors of the Newton Public Schools:

We school people generally, — superintendents, masters, teachers, — waste much time in talking and hearing, in writing and reading, about professional matters. The endless stream of talk and literature which flows unceasingly from our conventions, our meetings, and our educational press, interests us and bores us, delights us and disgusts us, inspires us and discourages us, excites our approval and arouses our opposition; but it all fails to make much impression on our work.

We lead dual lives. We lead a life of thought and theory, of dreams and visions, of argument and discussion, too little influenced by actual facts and conditions; and we lead a life of practice, too generally mechanical, routine practice, unenlightened and undirected by thought and ideal. Some of us find our chief delight in the life of ideas and pride ourselves upon it; among our numbers may be reckoned most superintendents, educational lecturers and writers, many supervisors, some principals, but very few teachers. Others of us are devoted to the "practical" life, and pride ourselves upon it; our numbers are composed mostly of "just plain teachers", with many principals, some supervisors and superintendents.

None of us has occasion for pride in his attitude. Such pride is an isolating force, both in the life of the individual and in the profession; we are all losers by it. What we most need is to come together, to come together frankly, without restraint, in the spirit of mutual helpfulness, that we may lead a single professional life. Only thus can we test our theories and give substance to our ideals; only thus can we improve our practice; only thus can we develop that insight and discrimination which we supremely need in our dealing both with thoughts and with things.

These considerations have led me to have printed the address to which you have already listened. In doing this I am aware that I take the risk of adding to the waste of time and effort which may have been occasioned by the talk and hearing, the further waste arising from printing and, possibly, reading.

If the whole matter is to rest with the talk and the hearing, the printing and the reading, it will surely be hardly worth the time and the trouble. But it is my hope and intention that it shall not rest here. I want to make sure that every one in our corps of instructors fully grasps and clearly comprehends the main principles stated and the general propositions laid down in the address. I want, then, to find out whether those principles and those propositions are possibly unsafe or unsound. At present I believe in them very firmly, but I am open to conviction. If they are untenable, I want to abandon them; if they are only partially sound, I want to modify them.

When we have comprehended, and have convinced ourselves of the soundness of these principles and proposi-

tions, modified, if need be, then, it is my desire that we apply ourselves to the working of them out fully and wisely in our schools. I realize that this will be no easy matter. It will require patience and mutual helpfulness; full success will probably come only after and through many mistaken efforts.

In these efforts at comprehension and practical realization of the program proposed, it seems wise, even necessary, that we each have that program by us in printed form. For the purpose of directing more effectively, but not of restricting, our thoughts and practical efforts, I have appended suggestive questions.

This document will be made the basis of our Masters' Conferences as long as its consideration proves fruitful. It is hoped that masters and supervisors will also find it profitable for use in their teachers' meetings, individual conferences, and supervision generally.

F. E. Spaulding,
Superintendent.

Newtonville, Mass.
October 15, 1907.

WHAT ARE YOU DOING?
WHY ARE YOU DOING IT?
WHY DO YOU DO IT LIKE THAT?

/7837

Three questions more abruptly simple, more profoundly searching, more intensely practical, more widely applicable, one cannot ask. The little child can comprehend and answer them, yet they exhaust the wisdom of the sage. To be required to answer these three questions would be at once the fairest and the most difficult test that could be given any one of us. It would be equally fair and equally difficult for kindergartner, grade teacher, master, high school teacher and special supervisor. What are you doing? Why are you doing it? Why do you do it like that?

While these questions apply to each one of us, they are not general, but extremely definite. They apply to the most trivial and incidental phase, as well as to the whole scope and purpose of each one's work. Just *what* are *you* doing now? *Why* are you doing *that?* Why do you do it in that particular way?

An Honest Self-Catechism.

These questions are so altogether blunt and direct that we instinctively hesitate to put them to another ; they are quite likely to be embarrassing; under many circumstances, they would be rightly considered impertinent. Most of us hesitate even more to put them to ourselves. Rarely do we call upon ourselves seriously and persistently to give honest answers to these questions. Perhaps we should find it embarrassing, impertinent, — even more embarrassing and impertinent than to be thus called to account by another.

However that may be. I am persuaded that a frequent, honest self-catechism of this kind is most salutary. And I wish you to join me, at this opportune time, in making such inquiry into the results, the purposes, and the methods of our work in the Newton schools.

Ideals *vs.* Practice.

Let us exercise the utmost frankness and good-will toward ourselves, with the sole purpose of seeing things as they are, that we may make them what they ought to be. Let us remind ourselves and agree at the outset that there are two sets of answers to these questions concerning what we are doing, our purpose and methods in doing it. There are our conscious answers in words, and there are the silent, often unconscious answers to be discovered in our acts. These two sets of answers may be in accord, or they may be absolutely contradictory. We may think we are doing one thing, working in one direction, when we are really doing something else, working in a quite different direction. We carry about with us a stock of principles, ideals, and rules of action, — high sounding phrases, which we find convenient to use in discussion and argument; they often have little influence on our practice. This condition is not usually due to dishonesty, to wilful deception; we really think we are carrying out our ideals. We think, for instance, we are training our pupils to be honest and truthful, when we are really encouraging dishonesty and falsehood; we think we are making them strong when we are making them weak. So it behooves us to seek the answers to our questions particularly in our acts, giving preference to this testimony whenever there is disagreement. And it is obviously of the

first importance that we realize any disagreement that may exist between our ideas and the facts, between our ideals and our practice.

The Purpose and Effect of Our General School Organization and Management.

Let us first direct our inquiry to the purpose and the effect of our general school organization and management. Most of us think, or assume without thinking, that the schools exist for the children; that they are organized and managed as they are, because such organization and management is determined by the highest welfare of the pupils. But, let us propose any marked change in this organization; how is such proposal received? From what point of view is the proposed change regarded? What questions are asked?

Does the first eager inquiry concern the effect of the proposed change on the pupils, the advantages and the disadvantages that may be expected to accrue to them as a result of the change? Seldom. We hear, rather, such queries and comments as these. "I haven't time. I have more than I can do now." "That upsets all my plans." "What shall I say to the parents? I must protect myself from them." "With that scheme, how can you mark a pupil? How can you determine whether A or B should have the higher mark?" "Teachers are not required to do that in such and such a city, or anywhere else that I ever heard of." "We can never 'cover the work' of the grade." "What will someone think if he comes into my room?" "I am afraid it will lower the standard of my school." "It will lower my record of promotions." "It will destroy all

uniformity." "I wonder what will be thought of next; these new notions keep things so stirred up all the time; I do wish we might be allowed to 'settle down' to something and stick to it. But I suppose it will have to be done; I wouldn't want to appear obstinate or unwilling to undertake what is expected of me." And so on.

In the midst of all these half-hearted irrelevancies, how we long for the refreshment even of a vigorous protest in the name of the children, though it were mistaken! It would at least serve to focus attention on what ought to be the decisive consideration.

I do not mean to say that the attitude unmistakably indicated by these quotations is universal, but I think you will recognize it as quite generally characteristic. I do not mean to say that the time and effort required of a teacher or master, the upsetting of cherished habits, the relative correctness of marks, even, are unworthy of consideration. I would not for a moment imply that we, as a rule, are unwilling to devote time and strength without stint to our work; on the contrary, I believe the tendency is rather to overdo. By no means do I wish to say that the welfare of our pupils is given little consideration. On the contrary, I believe we tend to be overconsiderate, to do too much for our pupils, *under established conditions*, under a routine that is dear to us, almost sacred. And this is the point, the vital point, at which the interests of the child are secondary, are even unconsidered. Machinery and routine must be kept inviolate. The child must fit the established conditions, our sacred routine; and we are most generous, prodigal of time and strength in our efforts to make him fit.

Rigid Schemes of Grading and Promotion.

Let us be more specific. We have long been spending our best efforts and suffering our deepest anxieties in our attempt to make every pupil fit a rigid scheme of grading and promotion, a scheme whose decree is, as some one has tersely and aptly said: "In together, all together, on together, out together." I think we are beginning, most of us, to realize some of the evils of this plan, to appreciate something of the violence which it works to the needs of our pupils. And we are earnestly trying throughout the city to correct this abuse. I am satisfied that we are making progress, that the conditions of grading and promotion are more favorable to the pupil today than they were two years ago. But I am also convinced that much of the improvement is due to the substitution of a new scheme of grading and promotion for the old, a new scheme which is in danger of becoming just as rigid, just as sacred, as the old, if it is not already so.

If we divide a class into two divisions, get those divisions five feet, or five months apart, and hold them there; if we divide a grade into two or three classes, get and hold these classes so many feet or so many months apart, we still have an inflexible system whose integrity takes precedence over the requirements of any or all pupils. Such a system is an improvement over one of yearly grades and annual promotions; pupils may be fitted to it with somewhat less violence; there is greater freedom of movement up or down the scale. But the spirit of its administration is the same as before; the system exists for itself, not for the pupils. They must be fitted to *it*; there

is no serious thought of fitting it to them. That would mean constant change in the system; we couldn't predict just where our class, our *class*, mind you, that we call IV B today, will be five months or five years hence. The attitude, the point of view, has not changed a particle; it is just what it was before the modifications in the scheme of grading and promotion were made; and it is radically wrong.

Keeping Children Together.

Indications of these mechanical conditions, of this perversion of our purposes, are innumerable; I meet them every day. I will mention only two, these two of frequent occurrence, perhaps we should rather say in constant evidence. A teacher, or a master, says to me, "Here is a small class, only twenty-five children; they are well-graded; I have decided to work them together: they can be kept together in everything." Of course they can be kept together! But what natural interests of those children demand that they should be kept together? Could anything indicate more conclusively that the system and not the child is paramount, is to dominate all the work in that room?

Mass Work *vs.* Individual Work.

I am not unmindful of the advantages, both to teacher and child, of such close grading that pupils can profitably recite together. A teacher of only twenty-five children cannot dispense with class work, ought not to dispense with it if she could. But class recitations, — this is the point, — the possibility of grouping together advantageously a number of children into one class, should be a wholly incidental outgrowth of the treatment of those children in accordance with their individual needs.

Because a certain twenty-five children can recite together today there is no good reason for thinking that they can continue together advantageously for six months or a year. If they should so continue, which is not at all impossible, while full justice is being done to the needs of each, well and good. But the moment the teacher determines that they shall so continue, she has determined the whole character of her work. She has determined to teach a class, and not individuals; she has determined to fit her pupils to a class scheme, instead of using the class organization in the interests of her pupils; she has probably determined, albeit unconsciously, to treat her pupils as passive, rather than as active beings; to do for them much that they ought to do for themselves; to load their memories instead of exercising their powers of observation, of comparison, of judgment and reason.

The Fundamental Importance of Our Conception of School Machinery.

The important thing is our attitude, our point of view, the conception we have of all this machinery of our schools; that will determine whether we master the machinery and use it, or whether we are to be mastered and used by it. The teacher with forty or fifty pupils says it is almost impossible for her to do individual work; we appreciate the difficulties; we sympathize, and admit that with such numbers good work of this kind should not be expected. But when the same teacher with only twenty-five pupils deliberately takes advantage of the improved conditions to do more rigid mass work than before, we conclude that she has no conception of the real meaning of individual work.

That teacher would still do mass work if she had only one pupil.

Individual work does not depend primarily upon the number of our pupils. Numbers may make individual work unsatisfactory, difficult, even impossible; but without the right conception there will be no individual work, no matter what the number of our pupils.

One More Indication of the Paramountcy of Routine.

One more indication of the paramountcy of system, of routine, and of the subordination of the pupils as indiviuals. Are we not pretty generally agreed that, on stormy days, when we listen in vain for the no-school signal, and when our attendance is considerably affected, the work does not amount to much? Those children who come — how we wish they had all stayed at home! — we keep busy in more or less harmless ways. But at best they are only marking time; we know it, and they know it. Do they not even carry that truth back to their homes, with the result that every stormy day many children are kept at home, not because the storm is considered too severe for them to go out, but because the parents know that the day at school will amount to little or nothing? If we were teaching individual pupils, and not classes and masses, if each pupil's advancement were limited only by his own ability and exertions, if our chief efforts were given to the help and progress of each pupil according to his need and ability, instead of to the fitting of all pupils to our school machinery, would the stormy day be of so little worth?

Would it not rather be an unusually profitable day for those in attendance?

Our willing, eager subjection to uniformity, to routine, is not confined to these larger matters of class organization, grading and promotion; it is altogether too characteristic of much of the detail of our work, of our methods of instruction. We will mention here only two or three of its typical manifestations, merely for illustration.

The Use and Abuse of Formulæ.

Consider the use, or rather the abuse, for it is chiefly that, of formulæ. Do you appreciate the real function of a formula? It serves usually, if it serves at all, as a substitute for thought. To be more exact, the formula enables, encourages, often compels, the pupil using it, to think on the lowest plane, to limit himself to the almost mechanical process of fitting factors to the terms of the formula. The pupil's attention is riveted to the formula, which, more often than not, is beyond his comprehension; he fails to grasp the real significance of the factors of his problem, their relation to each other; they interest him only as possible terms of the formula. When he has solved this problem in this way he is no wiser than before. Let him solve a hundred problems by the same formula; the only result is a mechanical facility in the use of that particular formula. He has gained no power in grasping and dealing with conditions at first hand, relying on his own intelligence and insight. He has probably gained no time, even, if that is a consideration worthy of mention, in the solution of the problems. For, unhampered by the formula, he is

almost sure to discover shorter ways of solving many of them.

Now, I would not banish formulæ, any more than I would abolish class work. Just as the class organization is most serviceable when it is used in the interest of the individuals who may chance to compose it, so the formula may be most serviceable when it is really used by the pupil. Just as it is an abuse of the class organization to make of it a rigid mold into which all pupils must fit and in which they must remain, so it is an abuse of the formula to require all pupils to use it, or to require or even to encourage any pupil to use it all the time.

Because one or a dozen of his forty patients has a broken or weak limb which needs temporary support, the surgeon does not forthwith apply splints to the corresponding limb of the whole forty, nor does he keep the weak limb bound after it is able to go alone. We apply our pedagogical splints indiscriminately; we retain them until they become shackles.

Elaborate Topical Analyses.

Elaborately wrought out topical analyses of a subject, which are so often imposed upon pupils, serve a function similar to that of formulæ; they are a substitute for thought; they restrict the pupil's mental operation to the lower planes. His chief concern becomes the fitting of subject matter to the topics, much as he fitted the factors of his problem to the terms of his formula. The delight and the power which come from grappling with facts and ideas at first hand, with little or no aid, is denied him.

Instead of compelling, even of assisting the pupil to think through and grasp the relations of the facts or events to which they refer, too generally our topics have just the opposite effect. The topic-tied pupil memorizes mechanically what his text-book or references give on each topic, with little effort and less encouragement to master through his own independent thought an understanding of the significance and the trend of the events or ideas with which he is supposed to be dealing. But the very order and arrangement of the topics, you say, express these relations, show even to the pupil's eye the connection of ideas and the progress of events. Ah, that is the very point! The one who made the topics, who worked them out, has done the thinking; he has done for the pupil what the pupil ought to do as fully as possible for himself. Finally, the recitation "by topics", as it is not infrequently conducted, serves to complete for the pupil the isolation of the facts and ideas which the topics individually suggest. Each topic is treated as though it were complete in itself, even the natural order of topics not infrequently being ignored. One pupil is called to recite on one topic; another pupil is called to recite on another topic; no one is called to tell what the topics are all about.

Just because we have ourselves worked out the topics we use, no matter how independently, let us not deceive ourselves as to their effect. From the standpoint of the pupil on whom they are imposed, they differ from similar topics which we can easily find ready-made, only in this, that the latter are probably superior.

Topics, as such, are not to be despised; they are really

indispensable. But they belong in the same category with grades, class organization and formulæ. Their value consists in their use, in their ministration to pupils' needs, not in their domination.

That the proper use and function of topics is often misconceived is evidenced in this, that we are quite likely to find them imposed in greatest luxuriance in the high school. If the pupil were trained to use them, that is to work them out himself, as he should be, their imposition by the teacher ought to diminish with the advancement of the pupil. We have here another iustance of the splint grown into a shackle.

Objects and Devices Used in Primary Grades.

The objects and devices which abound in the primary grades must be classed with topics and formulæ. While the pupil masters them and uses them, they are of great value. The moment they begin to get the mastery over the pupil, to restrict him, to hamper him, to keep him working on lower planes, to engage him doing easy things, mechanically, when he is capable of doing hard things, intelligently, that moment they become a curse.

The True Place and Function of System, Organization, Machinery.

System, organization, on a large scale, and on small scales, in little things and in great, is indispensable to efficiency. But all our organization, all our system must be subordinate, must be flexible, must be capable of ready adaptation to the one supreme factor in all our work, — the children, as individuals, that we are trying to educate.

We must control all the machinery with which we are surrounded, with which we are surrounding ourselves, in the interests of these children. This means the constant study of our pupils, to find out their individual capacities, their tendencies, their strength and their weakness, that we may see what they require; it means the constant adaptation, modification, elaboration, invention and rejection, of plans of classification and organization, of methods and devices.

A Subversive Proposition.

But such procedure must prove subversive of all system, do you say? Not at all. System is an orderly arrangement and connection of things, acts and ideas according to some definite plan. Our plan does not lack definiteness. We propose merely to elevate the children and their growing and varied needs to the dominant place; we propose to quicken our dead and deadening forms and formalities into life, to make them serve the life and development of our children.

The proposition is, indeed, subversive, — subversive not of system itself, however, but of that particular and pernicious system which subordinates life and growth to machinery.

The carrying out of this plan will change much of our former routine. It will change it as radically as we must change our point of view. It will assuredly keep things "all stirred up"; it will necessitate doing today something which we did not do yesterday; something different tomorrow, and again the next day, and the next; it will require us to do for one child what we do not do for another. Are all these changes, which we cannot make

once for all and then settle down again into a different order of routine, but which we have to look forward to day after day and year after year; are they abhorrent to us, unendurable? Can we be happy only in unchanging surroundings, busy with ever repeated activities? If so, then we ought to engage, — I say it in sincerity, not in sarcasm, — we ought to engage in some occupation in which uniformity of material, uniformity of process, and uniformity of product, is demanded.

Individuals *vs.* Human Units.

The vital, original, progressive thought and work of the world springs from individuals, — from individuals who have developed, each one, their peculiar talents, and who are in a position to exercise those talents freely. Nothing originates with organized masses doing the machine-work of the world, each human unit going through the same motions as hundreds of other human units day after day, displaced from time to time by mechanical appliances which do the work better than they did.

I mean no reproach. Machine-work is honorable; organized workers may be just as deserving of respect, as are those individuals who originate and initiate. But the former are legion; the latter are rare. The relative numbers of these two classes in the future will depend in no small measure upon our schools. If in them we are constantly looking for individual capacity and developing it, we may hope to multiply the men and women of originality, of marked talent, of genius, even. If, on the other hand, we mechanize our schools, if, even here, we organize individuals into masses of human units, treating

all alike and compelling all to go through the same routine, we shall have done our best to turn out only those capable of machine work.

The Basis of Recent Agricultural Progress.

More progress has been made in agricultural science in the last generation than in all the previous untold centuries since man began to eat bread "in the sweat of his face." Why? Simply because students of agriculture broke away from routine; they began to study the habits and needs of plants; they began to adapt their means and methods to definite ends; and the results have been marvelous. It is true, there are still not wanting old farmers, and young ones too, who scoff at these new notions; they prefer to follow the beaten path. But their attitude will not long nor seriously retard the progress of the new agriculture.

The same general principles which are revolutionizing agriculture, when applied to the education of our boys and girls, cannot fail to be followed by equally marvelous results. Indeed, the "wizard" of plant breeders has recently published a monograph in which he advocates the application to the breeding and rearing of children of the same principles by which he has wrought miracles with plants. While his views in details may be far from practical at present, his general thought is undoubtedly right.

What are We to Understand by Individual Work?

Let us make sure that we all have essentially the same conception when we speak of individuality, of the development of our pupils as individuals, of individual in dis-

tinction from class or mass work. The term has so many meanings and is used in so many ways even in educational circles, that it is quite possible for two of us to entertain conceptions entirely permissible, out of which we could develop practices diametrically opposed in their spirit and effects. The teacher whose work is dominated by the effort to keep her pupils all together usually does considerable individual work with her slower pupils in this sense, that she works with them, or rather for them, one by one, loading them with knowledge which they can scarcely bear, much less use, urging, coaxing, threatening, pushing and pulling them forward, that they may appear to keep within the ranks. But such individual work is diametrically opposed to the kind of individual work for which I am pleading; it is an incident of mass work and belongs in that category.

The individual work which I am advocating is characterized especially by the fact that each individual pupil is working himself, actively, independently, intelligently, according to his ability, with a full sense of responsibility, — the consciousness that he, and he alone, must do the work before him; that he, and he alone, will get the credit and all the benefits arising from the work he does; that he, and he alone, will suffer the consequences of any failure, or weakness on his part.

The Teacher's Function.

The teacher's function in this plan is, first, so to order the conditions in her room that every pupil can work in this way; secondly, to aid each pupil, both through individual conference and class exercises, to the end that his work may

be most effective. The aid which the teacher should give will exercise her highest professional skill, will demand her keenest insight. This aid must not consist merely in helping the pupil to do a problem, or to learn a lesson. Such aid is weakening; it fosters the habit and the feeling of dependence. The teacher's aid must be real aid, aid which enables the pupil to solve his problem and learn his lesson himself, aid that consciously strengthens the pupil, that both makes him stronger and makes him feel stronger.

Responsibility, an End and a Means of Education.

Responsibility, the willingness and the power to assume responsibilities wisely and to bear them courageously, is one of the most valuable results, — is really the highest end, of sound training; responsibility, the assuming and the bearing of responsibilities progressively and patiently, necessarily or voluntarily, is the only means to that end. To adjust responsibilities wisely, discriminatingly, is one of the most difficult things we teachers have to do. Is this the reason for our tendency to eliminate real responsibility almost completely from the life of the pupil?

Compulsion Not Necessary.

Observe. I have just said that the teacher's function is, first to make the conditions such that her pupils can work individually. I purposely stopped short of adding that she must then compel, or require, them to work in this way. For I am confident, both from my knowledge of human nature and of child nature, and from observations where the conditions have been made as described, that no

such compulsion will be necessary. Boldly remove both your artificial restraints and your artificial supports, which now prevent your pupils' going either forward or backward, to the right or to the left, as intelligent, individually responsible human beings, and you will be surprised and rejoiced at your pupils' response, — a manifestation of energy, of active interest and enthusiasm such as you have not previously witnessed in your school-room.

What Are We Really Trying to Do?

What, indeed, are we really trying to do in our schools? What product of our efforts do we desire? How do we measure the degree of our success? Why, what simple questions! We are trying to instruct, to educate our boys and girls, of course. These boys and girls, trained, educated, are the products we seek. The extent of their education measures the degree of our success.

But are we really trying to do that? Are we really seeking that product? Or do we only think, when we think anything about it, that such is the inspiration and purpose of our efforts? Let us recall what we agreed at the outset, viz., that there are two answers to the kinds of questions we are asking ourselves today, our conscious answer in words, and the answer to be read from our acts; and that these two answers are not necessarily in accord. I repeat my questions. What are we trying to do? What product do we seek? How do we measure our success?

How are we answering these questions by our acts? Let us forget for a moment the answer we have just given in words, forget what we are supposed to be doing, what we know we ought to be doing. Let us reflect and examine

unsparingly the actual ends, motives and criteria of our daily work. What we demand of ourselves now is, not a defense, but the truth. I believe you cannot radically disagree with me when I say that we are seeking, not all of us, I trust not any of us exclusively, but characteristically, we are seeking these things and things of this order. We want every one of our pupils to "cover the work of the grade" during the year; we want as clear a record of attendance as possible; we want all the written work of our pupils to present a neat appearance; we want uniformity in headings, in margins, in spacings; we want quiet, and order, and good positions in our class rooms; we want to "hold the attention" of every pupil; we want straight lines and orderliness in passing through the halls; we want to avoid friction with pupils and parents; we want to avoid the criticism of master, supervisor, superintendent, and others; we want everything and every activity in our school rooms and in our buildings to present a "good appearance." These are the things that we are really working for, and working very hard for; these are the things that worry us, when they go wrong; these are the things that delight us, when they go right.

We Are Sacrificing the Kernel to the Production of Husks.

And these things are all good. But they are good merely as incidents or means in the production of something as superior to them all as the kernel is superior to the husk; they are good as means to the development of boys and girls to be alert, intelligent, self-reliant, self-controlled and self-directed, resourceful, neat, orderly, and respectful. We are

making these miserable husks the end of our endeavor; we are sacrificing the precious kernel to their production.

Our Enormous Waste of Time and Effort.

Let us direct our attention now to a slightly different, but closely related aspect of our work. We hear no more common complaint and lament than this: We haven't time; we haven't time. That cry is almost universal. And yet, we can scarcely go into a school in this city, — or in any other city, for that matter, if this thought makes the truth any less unpalateable, — in which we do not find time, much time, misused, squandered, wasted, frittered away, with as little concern, apparently, as though there were an eternity at disposal.

Impossible! Why, we are as busy as we can be; we are fairly rushed from morning till night.

I believe it. I have seen it; and I have seen it often with pain and misgiving. But this observation is not to the point. Busyness and rush are in no way incompatible with waste of time and effort. In fact, there is not infrequently more than a chance connection between these phenomena.

We Teachers are an Unpractical Class.

We teachers are not much given to applying the fundamental principles of business, of the shop and the factory, if you please, to our work. An involuntary shudder goes over us at the mere coupling of the names of such gross, material, mercenary pursuits as make up business and factory life, with our high, ideal, spiritual calling. We are looked upon as an unpractical class. That estimate of us is undoubtedly justified. If it were true only of our relations to the so-called

practical affairs of life, we might well bear the stricture with equanimity, perhaps some of us with pride, even. But, most unfortunately, the criticism of unpracticality in respect to the affairs in which we are supposed to be experts, might be made with altogether too much truth. Outside critics have not yet generally discovered this weakness, although there is wide-spread conviction that our schools, for some reason, are not as efficient as they ought to be, or as they might be. It behooves us to discover and realize our own shortcomings, and to remedy them.

I have said that we waste time grossly; that we are characterized by unpracticality, even in the schoolroom. The fact, of course, follows naturally from the characteristic the characteristic is manifest in the fact. But I must not drop the matter with these bare statements; I must be more specific, or I shall appear to exemplify best of all the very fact and characteristic I am thinking to point out.

This is a Mutual Investigation.

Let us examine again together, quite dispassionately, what we are actually doing every day in our schools, the purpose for which it is done, and the efficiency of the process. This is a mutual investigation. It is not sufficient that one of us make observations and reach certain conclusions, and utter those conclusions, however well justified, with apparent dogmatism. We must investigate together; we must see the same things; then, I believe, we shall reach the same conclusions, each one self-convinced. Obviously, we cannot visit our own schools now, but we can call readily and vividly to mind an abundance of exercises and scenes with which we are only too familiar.

One General Observation Regarding Our Unpracticality.

But, first allow me this general observation, which, if it has any value, is quite apropos. I can recall in all my experience very few teachers or masters who occasionally, still fewer who constantly and systematically, applied any serious test of efficiency to their plans or methods of work, or who even attempted to apply any such test. In my experience, schoolroom methods and processes are rarely judged from the standpoint of simple efficiency. This question is seldom asked: Is this method or process the most effective way of producing the result I desire? Too often, I fear, the question could not be asked, much less answered, for we have not determined in our own minds what result we do desire.

The Sole Justification of Any Method.

We justify our methods on all sorts of grounds, "pedagogical" grounds, we like to call them, except the one and, broadly understood, the sole ground on which any method can be justified, the ground of efficiency. These are the most favored, the determining characteristics of an approved method or exercise. It must interest the children; it must hold their attention; it must keep them busy and reasonably quiet; if it keeps them busy and quiet a long time at a stretch, so much the better; it must be easy of preparation and oversight; it must be capable of quick assignment and of repeated use. Of course, as a rule, it is expected eventually to lead somewhere. But there is little concern about the time it will take the pupil to arrive by that route. It is so much better, you know, not to hurry

the children; they are so young and immature! As though anyone, old or young, mature or immature, had to hurry more in going directly to his destination than in going by roundabout and devious ways!

But I am making only a general observation that my individual experience thus far seems to justify. Your observations along this line are very likely different. I gladly refrain from pressing my individual opinion, which further experience may force me to modify, concerning so large a subject; for I would not be classed with those "nature-faking" controversialists who declare that a thing never has happened, never could have happened, and never can happen, — chiefly because they have not witnessed it.

Let us to our investigation of facts about whose existence we all agree, — facts which, I believe, will reveal to us all a well-nigh inconceivable disregard of the value of time and effort. I shall make no attempt at exhaustiveness in the facts which I bring before us for examination. I shall choose rather a few quite prevalent practices, each typical of many which observation and reflection should enable every one of us to supply.

The Sacred Spelling Device.

We will turn our attention, first, to that sacred device for learning the spelling lesson, viz: *copying each word ten times.* If we are in good humor, perhaps the words need be copied only five times each; but if things in general have been going badly, particularly if there were many mis-spelled words in yesterday's exercise, or if little seat-work has been planned for to-day, each word must be copied twenty times, perhaps twenty-five or even fifty

times. And the luckless youngster who then misses a word is to be congratulated if he escapes with a hundred copies.

Pray, observe that this exercise possesses most of the approved characteristics already noted, many of them in their most perfect form. It compels some degree of attention on the part of the pupils; it keeps them busy and fairly quiet; nothing could be easier of preparation and oversight; it is capable of instant assignment and of infinite repetition; but, best of all, it is adjustable! We can as readily say copy fifty or a hundred times as we can say five or ten times.

But what of the efficiency of this method? Need I say another word? Yes, I will; for I would finally exterminate it, with all that it signifies. And it dies so hard. This is by no means the first occasion, as most of you must well know, on which I have thought to give this abominable thing its quietus. This is one thing, and I believe the only thing, which our course of study tells us we must *never* do. And yet, it seems as though I ran across it somewhere almost every day.

The Real Objection to Our Sacred Spelling Specific.

But what is really the objection to this method, administered in moderate doses, of course, many of us must be asking ourselves. Is it not a well established psychological fact or principle that writing a thing helps to fix that thing in the memory, particularly in the muscular memory? And is not this just what we desire in spelling, to fix the word in the muscular memory, so that

the hand can write it correctly with a minimum of direction from the higher centers of thought? Yes; and we might remark, parenthetically, that it is also a well established fact that a little psychology is a dangerous thing.

Writing a word may be an efficient means of fixing the letters in their order; as a means to this end two writings are more effective than one. But the moment a teacher directs a pupil to write a word five times, or ten times, or any other number of times, that moment she makes the writing of the word, and the writing of it a certain number of times, and not the learning of the word, the end of the pupil's effort. And the pupil invariably so regards it. I can predict with almost absolute certainty the answers, even the wording of the answers, which I shall receive to two questions addressed to a pupil engaged in this senseless exercise, so many times have I put these questions and received these answers. I ask, "What are you doing, my child?" "Copying my spelling words ten times." "What are you doing that for?" "'Cause teacher told us to."

Here is a case in which I am convinced the child is doing exactly what he thinks he is doing, nothing more and nothing less. Children are not nearly as prone to deceive themselves in this matter as are we older folks. But if any of us would like even more indisputable evidence that making the required number of copies of each word is the sole end which the child is trying to achieve, we can probably find such evidence without much difficulty. I occasionally run across variations of the stupid monotony such as this. A child copying three-syllable words copies the first syllable of a word the required number of times,

then the last syllable an equal number of times, and finally fills in the middle syllable! Or he may copy the first syllable of all the words once, then add the second syllable of each, and so on. Or, again, he may copy the first syllable of all the words in order, each the required number of times, then the second, and finally the last. Oh, there are many little opportunities here for the exercise of originality! I drop these hints for what they are worth. Such variations of the copying process, more generally adopted, would tend to add to this exercise the one approved characteristic which is usually lacking, that is, the element of interest.

We can but be impressed with the absurdity, the enormity, of the exercise in which the words are so broken up in the copying, considered as a means to the learning of the correct spelling. But I have not the slighest doubt that such copying is almost, if not just as effective as the straight copying of each word. And it has this advantage; it gives the poor child an opportunity to exercise a little thought, to initiate a little originality on his own account.

How May the Spelling Lesson be Attacked Effectively?

How shall we, then, attack the spelling lesson effectively? We must train each pupil, — the learning of a spelling lesson is a purely individual matter, — we must train each pupil to determine for himself just what difficulties the lesson presents to him; he will usually find that some of the words present no difficulty, that most of them contain not more than one or two difficult spots. The difficulties determined, the pupil must then apply himself intelligently to their mastery; that is, he must employ those means which he finds to be

most effective for him. Copying a difficult syllable, as a means to its mastery, is one quite effective way for many people, not for all. For one who finds copying to be the most effective means of learning, copying is the very thing to do; never, however, should one copy five, or ten, or any other magic number of times, but in each instance just as many times as are necessary to effect the desired result.

Some of us may recall that a dozen years ago Dr. J. M. Rice, of New York, made quite a sensation both within and without educational circles by his elaborate investigations of the subject of spelling as taught in the public schools of several of the principal cities of the country. One of Dr. Rice's conclusions, apparently absurd, but based, he declared, strictly upon facts and statistics as he gathered them, was this, — that it makes no difference whether fifteen minutes or forty-five minutes per day be devoted to the study of spelling; the additional time does not appreciably improve the result. And Dr. Rice, I remember, very aptly entitled one of his articles on the subject, published, I believe, in *The Forum*, "The Futility of the Spelling Grind."

In the light of all that we have said and of all that we know about the conventional ways of teaching spelling, are we not prepared to accept Dr. Rice's apparently absurd conclusion as possibly, nay, as only too probably correct? How, indeed, could it be otherwise? Whether it be spelling or any other thing, what difference does it make, what difference can it make, whether we spend much or little time, provided we spend that time in doing, not the thing in hand, but in doing something else?

Our Work in Spelling Typical.

I have spent so much time with you on the subject of spelling, not because of its superior importance, but almost wholly because the handling of this subject is typical of so much. Can we not, every one from the kindergarten to the high school, think of a score of things which are being treated habitually in just such inappropriate, ineffective ways?

Our Expensive Manufacturing Enterprises.

Let us turn our attention now, but more briefly, to other prevalent ways in which we are inexcusably wasting precious time and effort. Take the matter of copying by the pupils, I mean copying from the blackboard and from dictation elaborate topical outlines, analyses, problems, notes and directions of various kinds, of which the sole result, often the sole purpose, is this, — a copy of the thing in question, in the hands of each pupil.

This is not an educational, a "pedagogical" exercise, and cannot be justified on that ground. On the contrary, we must admit that this kind of copying, because of the conditions under which it is usually done, tends to foster habits of carelessness, of inaccuracy, of slovenliness, even of dawdling and sloth. At best, its effect on the pupil is rarely other than negative. Taking the most favorable view of it, then, we can consider it only from the standpoint of a manufacturer.

Let Us Calculate the Cost of Production.

How many of us have ever thought to calculate the cost of production when we engage our pupils in these manufac-

turing exercises? Let us do it, for once; it may surprise those of us who chance to be endowed with some measure of business instinct.

The time of a pupil in the higher grammar grades and in the high school, — the places where much, probably most of this factory work is carried on, — is worth about fifteen cents an hour at such relatively unskilled labor, or service, as most of the pupils could perform. On this basis, then, the time of a class of forty pupils is worth $6 per hour, an amount from six to ten times as large as most of us teachers receive who control the time of these pupils.

Suppose we put such a class of pupils to copying for fifteen minutes from the blackboard, — not an unusually long time, according to my observations. As the product of these fifteen minutes' work, we have to show forty copies, of perhaps two pages each, of more or less accurate, more or less legible, more or less presentable, written matter. The cost of these copies, not reckoning the teacher's time, has been $1.50; as a single item, trifling, of course. But we could have secured an equal number of hektograph copies, all alike, everyone easily legible, accurate and presentable, for fifteen cents. If we were to have use for a considerable number of copies of the same thing, to be given to several classes or divisions, or to be used through several years, they could be produced for five cents, even two cents, the forty copies. I think we cannot fail to see that any unsubsidized manufacturing enterprise conducted on this basis must inevitably fail before it could be even started.

But, here again, I am not holding up to view these little thoughtless ventures of ours into the manufacturer's

realm chiefly because of their intrinsic importance, although undoubtedly they are all together costing the city some hundreds, quite possibly thousands of dollars a year. But this is my purpose; we must see that this kind of work is typical of much more, and we must realize what that means.

The Value of a Child's Time as a Pupil.

We have estimated in the very lowest terms, that of unskilled labor, the value of a pupil's time. A pupil's time as a student must be reckoned on a different basis. Just how much it is worth in dollars and cents we cannot say. Rough estimates which have been made would indicate, and I think we all have confidence in the enhancement of a person's productive power through education to believe, that the value of a child's time, twelve to eighteen years of age, if spent in profitable study, may be estimated conservatively at three times the figures we used. And all of us recognize the many invaluable results of time spent in study, — results in no way reducible to a cash estimate.

Must we not, then, think seriously on these things, we who control the time and the movements of so many boys and girls, control them absolutely during five, and partially, perhaps, during one or two more hours each day? We have no right to direct the precious time and efforts of those boys and girls except in the doing of things worth while, the things best worth while, and in the doing of those things in the most effective way.

A "Well-Timed" but Valueless Exercise.

Let us recall now and consider very briefly several other

typical and prevalent means of wasting time and effort. Think of those exercises — so many of them — tame, passive, monotonous, tedious exercises, in which we accomplish nothing,— because we attempt nothing. Our program calls for an exercise,— probably most of us in the grammar grades are thinking of reading,— we start that exercise on time and we close it on time; we start it at the page and paragraph where we chanced to leave it at the last exercise, and we close it wherever we happen to be when the time has expired; it is usually a "well-timed" exercise, and that is the best that can be said of it.

Of course, put on the defensive, we can maintain and possibly convince — ourselves, that we were seeking "better expression" as the result of the exercise. But the facts are that the pupils' reading was no better than it had been before, even that no single pupil read as expressively as he could, that no single pupil made any serious effort to read his best, and, finally, that we, as teacher, did little or nothing to make any pupil read as well as he was already able to read, much less to enable him to read better than he ever could before. In the light of these facts, we cannot reasonably hope that there may have been any positive result of the exercise in the shape of power or habit of better oral reading. On the contrary, if we are frank, we must admit that the exercise was really injurious, that it contributed a little to that progressive deterioration in oral reading which is unmistakeable as we advance beyond the primary grades, reaching its climax — or ought we to say anti-climax? — in the high school.

But perhaps we were paying no particular attention to

expression in this exercise; possibly we were having the children read simply "to get the thought,"— as though, indeed, they should ever read without getting the thought! But did the children get the thought? There was certainly little to indicate to the careful listener and observer that they did "get" much thought; and there was much evidence that they were not thinking, that what they were supposed to be reading was not arousing and directing their thoughts. And we as teacher — what were we teaching? — did nothing but call out, "that will do," and "next!"

We must confess that such exercises not simply waste time, they kill it.

Abortive Efforts.

Then there are those exercises in which we attempt something definite and important, perhaps work very hard, even very effectively as far as we go, but still accomplish nothing; and all because we didn't quite reach the point, or, having reached it, did not fix it, before the exercise closed. Unfortunately, these abortive efforts do usually accomplish one thing; they dull the pupil's interest, and so make more difficult the next attempt.

The Waste of the Unemployed.

We will here refer to only one more typical waste of time — would that this really completed the list! — the waste which occurs through the inactivity, or the misdirected, ineffective activity of a portion of our pupils. This waste is enormous. When we are teaching classes instead of individuals, how much of the time is thus wasted for most of our pupils? How many of our pupils thus waste most of their time?

We Must Learn to Apply Sound Business Principles.

However firmly we may believe, or affect to believe, that our professional work is removed and should be removed far above and away from ordinary business motives and consideration, we must learn to apply in our work many of those principles of business which are the very foundation of business success. Rightly applied, those same principles will contribute as much to educational as to material progress. We may profitably learn from business life, above all things, the fundamental principles of efficiency. We may learn to determine always, in the least things as well as in the greatest, just what we wish to accomplish; we may learn to apply those means which seem to be best adapted to the accomplishment of our end; we may learn, further, to test rigidly and frequently the actual efficiency of the means we are employing; we may learn to "stop the leaks" which are constantly occurring.

What of Ourselves?

Thus far we have been considering our work, as we ought nearly always to do, from the standpoint of the pupil, observing its effect upon him. Very briefly, we will now turn our attention to ourselves.

If our work as teachers is to be most effective, essentially the same conditions must prevail for us that we demand for our pupils. I cannot do the work of any one of you, nor can I do it for you; no one of you can do my work, nor can you do it for me. We can help each other. No two of us can work effectively in just the same way; we ought not to attempt it.

What Each One of Us Ought to be Doing.

The kind of work we ought to be doing, the kind of work I ought to be doing, the kind of work each one of you ought to be doing, I can characterize in no better way than by quoting the exact words I have already used regarding each pupil's work. Each one of us should be "working himself, actively, independently, intelligently, according to his ability, with a full sense of responsibility,— the consciousness that he, and he alone, must do the work before him; that he, and he alone, will get the credit and all the benefits arising from the work he does; that he, and he alone, will suffer the consequences of any failure, or weakness on his part."

Are Conditions Favorable?

Are the conditions under which you are working such that you can work in this way? If not, it is your first and most important duty to make that fact known, in case the remedy is beyond your own control. I invite and shall welcome any honest suggestions on this subject. It is not wholly impossible that we must change our point of view and reconstruct our relations to each other, as radically as we must change our point of view and reconstruct our relations to our pupils.

The Relation of the Supervisory Force to the Teachers.

Of one thing I am sure, respecting the relation of superintendent, supervisors, and masters to the teachers. Defining that relation, again I can quote almost verbatim, and say what I have said concerning the proper relation of the teacher

to each one of her pupils. It is the function of each one of us, masters, supervisors and superintendent, each in his place, "first, so to order the conditions surrounding each teacher that she can work in the way described; secondly, to aid each teacher, both through individual conference and in groups, to the end that her work may be most effective." Continuing that quotation, I may say that "the aid which we should give will exercise our highest professional skill, will demand our keenest insight. This aid must not consist merely in helping the teacher to do her particular, special tasks. Such aid is weakening; it fosters the habit and the feeling of dependence. Our aid must be real aid, aid which enables the teacher to solve her problems and do her work herself,— aid that consciously strengthens the teacher, that both makes her stronger and makes her feel stronger."

A False Position.

I have known many masters and superintendents who took this position. They said: "We have a right to assume that our teachers are prepared for their work when they come to us; all that is demanded of us, and the best thing that we can do, is to give them the opportunity to work, and then *let them alone.*" And I have frequently known this attitude of masters and superintendents to be strongly approved by their teachers. The highest praise which the teachers can accord them seems to be this: "*They let us alone.*" And I have usually thought that these superintendents and masters manifested the best wisdom which they possessed in letting their teachers alone; and that for doing this, their teachers really accorded them the highest meed of praise to which they were entitled.

But I do not hesitate to express to you my deliberate opinion that any master or superintendent who demonstrates the fact that the greatest aid he can render his teachers is to let them alone, also proves conclusively that he is an extravagant luxury. He is drawing professional pay for clerical work and unskilled labor.

Masters, you and I have no right to our positions because we chanced to be born men, nor even because we were fortunate enough to secure our appointments. We must justify our existence every day.

Conclusion.

In conclusion, I have no apology to offer for inviting you all to make with me this mercilessly frank examination of our work. I might have spent this hour in commending the rare spirit that you have always shown, the splendid earnestness of your efforts, and the success, too, which your efforts have achieved; such commendation is richly merited. Or I might have told you that we have here in Newton a school system second to none in the country; that in some lines, at least, the best work to be found anywhere can be seen right in your schools. And in telling you this, I trust that I should have spoken within the limits of the truth. But I chose rather to pay you a higher compliment than can be expressed in any words of commendation concerning what you have been and what you have done in the past; and at the same time to bring before you a program for the future, — herein lies the compliment, — of infinitely more moment to the children of this city, to ourselves, even, than could possibly be any self-satisfied contemplation of the fact,

if it be a fact, that the Newton schools are as good as the best.

If there is any satisfaction to be derived from this thought, I can assure that the Newton schools have already been brought practically to the limit of perfection, if we measure them by the standards which have so largely dominated our activities in the past. Working along the old lines, the utmost we can hope to do is to keep our schools where they are today.

If, however, we can adopt the program and carry out successfully the principles we have been considering, there is no near limit fixed to the progress which must follow. Let no one deceive himself with the thought that I am proposing that you work any harder or any longer than you have been working. I fear that too many of you are already working too hard and too long. What we all need, and what I am pleading for, is not that we spend more *time*, but more *thought* upon our work; not that we work harder but more wisely.

It is not as a mere matter of policy that I have tried to talk *with* you, rather than *to* you, or *at* you, today; that I have tried to enlist the independent observation and reflection of each one of you on matters that so vitally concern us all; that I have asked each one to draw his own conclusions: and that I now ask each one to make his own resolutions. I have treated you and the subject in this way, because the problem that is before us is *our* problem. I am sure I cannot solve it alone; I do not believe that any one, or any dozen, of you can solve it alone. I *do* believe that we can all solve it together.

SUGGESTIVE QUESTIONS.

I. In General.

1. What are the principal theses of the paper?

2. Are the arguments and illustrations used in support of these theses sound, fair, and to the point?

3. What additional arguments and illustrations in support of these theses can you adduce?

4. What arguments and illustrations can you bring forward in opposition to these theses? Please be absolutely frank and as honestly critical as possible.

5. On the whole, are you convinced or unconvinced that the theses are sound and practical? If they appear to you wholly unsound or unpractical, what are your views on the matters to which they refer? If they appear to you only partially sound and practical, how would you modify them so that they would meet your full approval?

II. The Purpose and Effect of General School Organization and Management? P. 3.

1. Is the reception usually accorded to a proposed change in organization or management fairly represented by the quotations?

2. Do these expressions represent the real attitude of the speakers?

3. Is there a vital point at which the children's interests are really secondary to our routine and machinery? Bring together all the evidence you can both for and against this proposition.

III. Rigid Schemes of Grading and Promotion. P. 5.

1. Have you ever personally observed any evil effects of the usual plan of yearly grades and annual promotions? If so, what?

2. What are the chief advantages of this plan? Speak strictly according to your own observation and experience.

3. Do you consider the plans and the practices regarding grading and promoting, as they exist in your school today, better or poorer than two years ago? In what respects?

4. Wherein does the present plan and practice differ from the old in respect to its rigidity?

IV. Keeping Children Together. P. 6.

1. What evidences, other than the two "indications" mentioned, have you observed of the domination of the mass rather than of individuals?

2. What valuable features do you find in class work?

3. What objectionable features?

4. Is it possible to retain the valuable features while doing justice to individuals?

V. The Fundamental Importance of Our Conception of School Machinery. P. 7.

1. Do you maintain that machinery and routine, or pupils, as individuals, should dominate the work of your school?

2. Give as much evidence as you can, based on fact

and observation, to show that the one or the other does actually determine the practice in your room or in your building.

VI. The Use and Abuse of Formulæ. P. 9.

1. Is the real function, the use and the abuse, of formulæ, fairly represented?

2. What formulæ are you accustomed to use; to what extent do you use them; why do you use them; what advantages and what disadvantages have you observed to result?

VII. Elaborate Topical Analyses. P. 10.

1. Is the analysis and the criticism of the function and use of topics fair and warranted, as far as it goes?

2. What are your ideas, and what is your practice respecting topics?

3. What good and what evil effects have you observed which were due to your use of topics?

4. Just why do you use topics as you do?

5. What different course have you ever pursued, and with what results?

VIII. Objects and Devices in Primary Grades. P. 12.

1. What objects and devices are used in your primary grades?

2. What is the purpose of each?

3. How are they used so that they serve their purpose?

4. What evidence have you that each one does serve its purpose?

5. What misuse of objects and devices have you ever seen? Explain fully.

IX. The True Place and Function of System, Organization, Machinery. P. 12.

1. What changes in the general organization, classification, management of your own room or building have you made recently? For what purpose?

2. What methods or devices in the presentation of work or the conduct of exercises have you recently originated, abandoned, or modified? For what purpose?

X. Individuals *vs.* Human Units. P. 14.

1. Do you believe in looking for individual capacity and seeking to develop it, or is it really better to treat all alike, leaving individual capacity to discover and develop itself?

2. What marked differences of capacity, interest and tendency have you observed in your pupils?

3. What difference, if any, has this made in your treatment of them?

XI. What are we to Understand by Individual Work? P. 15.

1. Do you believe in "individual work", as here described? Why, or why not?

2. How many pupils have you who are generally working in this way? How many who are working in this way in some things, or occasionally? Why are they not so

working constantly, in all things? This will be an appropriate place to discuss plans of work in the different subjects.

XII. The Teacher's Function. P. 16.

1. Have you ordered the conditions in your room, or building, so that your pupils can work in the way described?

2. In so ordering conditions, what changes have you made?

3. If you have not done this, what efforts have you made?

4. What difficulties have you encountered?

5. What kind of aid do your pupils seek?

6. What evidence have you that they are growing stronger or weaker, more self-reliant or more dependent?

XIII. Responsibility, an End and a Means of Education. P. 17.

1. For what do you hold your pupils responsible?

2. What evidence have you that they feel responsible for these things?

3. Are their responsibilities imposed as a part of their training, or mainly incidentally?

4. What growth do your pupils show in power to discharge responsibilities?

XIV. Compulsion Not Necessary. P. 17.

1. When given the opportunity to work "individually", how have your pupils responded?

2. What seems to be the motive of those who do

well? Of those who do only fairly well? Of those who do poorly?

3. What responsibility do they seem to feel for their success or failure? How do they manifest their feeling?

XV. What Are We Really Trying to Do? P. 18.

1. To what extent are you seeking primarily the things enumerated, and things of that order?

2. If you think you are making the needs of your pupils of first importance, show what you are doing to this end.

XVI. Our Enormous Waste of Time and Effort. P. 20.

1. How many schoolrooms do you know in which less than one hour a day, nearly one-fourth of the time, is wasted?

2. How many schoolrooms do you know in which one-half the time is wasted?

XVII. We Teachers are an Unpractical Class. P. 20.

1. To what extent do you agree with the observation regarding the general unpracticality of teachers?

2. How many teachers do you know who are in the habit of applying rigidly the test of efficiency to their plans and methods?

3. What is your practice in this respect?

XVIII. The Sole Justification of Any Method. P. 22.

1. What do you think of the statement that efficiency is the sole ground on which any method can be justified?

2. What criticism would you make of the "determining characteristics of an approved method or exercise"?

XIX. The Sacred Spelling Device. P. 23.

What can you say from experience or observation in favor of the "sacred device for learning the spelling lesson?"

XX. How May the Spelling Lesson be Attacked Effectively? P. 26.

1. How many of your pupils study their spelling lessons intelligently?

2. What do you do to help them to study more effectively?

3. What other ways besides copying do your pupils find effective?

4. What variation have you observed in the way different pupils attack and master their spelling?

5. What are the dangers in a class exercise on the difficulties in a spelling lesson?

XXI. Our Work in Spelling Typical. P. 28.

What other plans and practices have you observed which are similar in their wastefulness and ineffectiveness to the spelling device.

XXII. Our Expensive Manufacturing Enterprises. P. 28.

1. How much time do your pupils spend in the kind of copying indicated?

2. Why do you have them spend any time in this way?

3. What other non-educational occupations do you require, or have you seen, in a schoolroom?

XXIII. A "Well-Timed" But Valueless Exercise. P. 30.

1. How much of your daily program is given up to exercises of this kind?

2. What lessons suffer most frequently, and most severely, in this way?

3. Under what circumstances may such a lesson ever be justified?

4. Why do pupils generally read so poorly in grammar grades and in the high school?

5. What are some of the evidences of passive reading? of active?

6. What are you doing to improve the reading in your schools? With what result?

XXIV. Abortive Efforts. P. 32.

1. Why should we seek in every exercise to accomplish some definite thing?

2. Is this possible in all subjects? Illustrate.

3. Under what circumstances should an exercise be closed before the thing attempted has been accomplished?

XXV. The Waste of The Unemployed. P. 32.

1. What portion of your pupils' time is wasted through inactivity, half-activity, misdirected and ineffective activity?

2. What is the cause of this waste and how are you seeking to check it?

XXVI. We Must Learn to Apply Sound Business Principles. P. 33.

1. In what ways not already mentioned are time and effort wasted?

2. How much time, previously wasted, have you been able to save? How?

3. What wastes do you see which you are not yet able to check? What efforts are you making?

XXVII. What Each One of Us Ought to be Doing. P. 34.

1. Do you want to work in the manner indicated?

2. Do you feel that you are working in that way?

XXVIII. Are Conditions Favorable? P. 34.

1. What conditions surrounding you are unfavorable to your own "individual work"?

2. Who is responsible for the unfavorable conditions?

3. What change, if any, in the attitude and relations to each other of superintendent, supervisors, masters and teachers, do you think desirable? Make any suggestions frankly.

XXIX. The Relation of the Supervisory Force to the Teachers. P. 34.

1. What can superintendent, supervisors and masters do to make the conditions surrounding teachers more favorable to successful work?

2. Wherein does supervisory aid lack in effectiveness?

3. To what extent are we, every one of us, trying to conceal our weaknesses, rather than seeking aid frankly to overcome them?

XXX. A False Position. P. 35.

1. In about what proportion is your time, as master, divided between real, professional supervision, clerical work, unskilled labor, and other duties?

2. What duties of the highest order, that is, requiring more skill and intelligence than most teachers possess, do you habitually perform?

3. How can you increase your value to your school?

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

Form L9–Series 4939

UCLA-Young Research Library
LB41 .N48
yr
L 009 573 129 5

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 001 228 742 1